

WATER COMMITTEE
JANUARY 28, 2004
MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: **Chuck Watkins, Chairman**
 Dr. George Patton, Vice Chairman
 Chris Cofty
 Tony Parrott
 Chris Venice

NON-VOTING MEMBERS: **Jim Mallett**

STAFF PRESENT: **Dennis Davenport**
 Russell Ray

ABSENT: **Bill McNally**

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Chuck Watkins at 8:00 A.M.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE MEETING ON JANUARY 14, 2004.

Vice Chairman Dr. George Patton made the motion and Tony Parrott seconded, to approve the minutes from the meeting on January 14, 2004. There was no opposition.

II. PRESSURE IMPROVEMENTS - HIGHWAY 74 NORTH.

Chris Venice presented a map of the northern portion of Fayette County. The area covered is north of Jenkins Road and west of the railroad. There are 3600 acres. Current residential population is 2,209. Future population will add 4,359 based on the zoning. The total residential population is projected to be 6,568. There is a lot of non-residential acreage. There are some non-residential water users, such as churches, schools and industrial property. She distributed this information to the Committee. In gathering the information they assumed the residential population in Tyrone and the County would be one to two acre lots and they took out ten percent of the property for infrastructure.

Mr. Parrott commented that we do not know how much of the area will be commercial. Mrs. Venice stated the only commercial is the golf driving range (Wendell Coffey). Mr. Parrott went on to say, that he and Mr. Mallett have considered an option between having a pressurized tank and an elevated tank in the area.

EXECUTIVE SESSION:

Tony Parrott made a motion and Chris Venice seconded to adjourn to executive session for discussion of one real estate item.

Vice Chairman Dr. George Patton made a motion to recommend to the Board of Commissioners authorizing Mallett & Associates to move forward with a study and to report back as soon as feasible on a particular piece of property.

III. LEGISLATIVE CHANGES FOR WATER CONSERVATION MEASURES.

Mrs. Venice stated that at the last meeting there was some discussion about the water conservation legislative recommendations the Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District (MNGWPD) is putting forward. She distributed a memo to the Committee giving the background information. The first two pages are general background stating which measures are going forward for legislative approval, and the pros and cons. The last couple of pages is actually a chronology of events.

She went on to say the MNGWPD originally recommended ten water conservation measures. Of those ten, three require legislative approval to be enacted. Of those three, they are going forward with two of them; the plumbing retrofit on resale of homes and the rain sensor shut off switches on new irrigation centers. On the plumbing retrofit of resale of homes, the second page has a list of the requirements there would be for every home; low flow toilets, shower heads, etc. Documentation will have to be provided at closing. The District is saying the pros of this legislation are that we can speed up the savings of water that are naturally occurring through new house construction and old houses being demolished. They say 81% of the homes in the sixteen county region were constructed prior to 1994. Housing accounts for 43 1/2% of water consumption. By retrofitting, the homeowner can save on reduced water usage and pay for the retrofits in less than three years. Los Angeles seems to be the poster child for flat line on water usage, because they have gone to a heavy retrofit system. The cons are, even the District recognizes the fact that the cost would be estimated at \$650.00 per household to retrofit an average of two toilets, two showerheads and four faucet aerators. They will have to pay to have a plumber or some other designated person come out and certify that these changes have been made.

Mrs. Venice stated that she believes somebody has to maintain these documents. Who else, but government, somewhere, will probably end up maintaining these documents. When you replace older fixtures, you can open up a whole can of problems with leaks and poor fits. This is the only retro penalty measure. Everything else in the water conservation area, even the rain sensor shut off switches start with new systems. It would be more consistent to just continue with requiring the low flow retrofit (low flow fixtures) with new housing as currently required by the 1994 legislation. The rain sensor shut off switches on irrigation systems, again, are only on new systems. People have the choice whether they want to install a new irrigation system or not. Savannah has shown a 20% decrease in summertime usage due to such equipment. They have had these requirements since 1991.

Mrs. Venice added that Fayette County is on file with the District as having sent in

numerous comments regarding water conservation measures. We believe that each jurisdiction should be able to use any of these ten measures they think is appropriate to obtain the 11% goal of water conservation. We also should receive credit for existing water conservation policies. We have also expressed concerns over the conservation rate structure, which is another of the ten measures. We believe that conservation pricing should take into account the water usage and needs of different size families, as well as the billing cycle. We are also on record as saying we are unable to support the required retrofit. It was burdensome and should be required of non-residential as well. It is the only retrofit that is punitive on existing homeowners.

Mrs. Venice commented there is a question about people on wells who are not counted in the water conservation gallon totals. Would they have to retrofit as well? That has never been addressed. On January 8, 2004 the MNGWPD Board voted unanimously to send both these measures forward for legislative recommendation. They are contacting Dekalb representative Karla Drenner to introduce the legislation. Our representative at this time is Ken Steele. He attended that meeting.

The committee discussed the cost of having a plumber come out, people no longer having receipts for the work, and replacing the toilets or just putting some type of device on the water line. Mrs. Venice clarified that the legislation requires a 1.6 gallon flush toilet. The question came up about outside faucets. Mrs. Venice agreed to check on the questions and bring this back to the Committee. Dennis Davenport commented he would search for any information the Committee might need.

Mr. Parrott commented that DNR will look at these things when it is time for our permits to be renewed.

IV. DISCUSSION OF REDOING FILTER #7 AT CROSSTOWN WATER PLANT.

Mr. Mallett explained that the Water System would like to redo the filter bottom of Filter #7. There is a new filter media that is called GAC (Granulated Activated Carbons) that we would like to try. It would take the place of sand, gravel and anthracite that is in the filter now. Manufacturers say the water quality coming out is better. TOC's are reduced. Trihalomethanes may be, also. Mr. Parrott commented the reduction is figured in parts per trillion.

Mr. Mallett went on to say the manufacturer recommends you put four feet of this material in the filter. When we built the Crosstown Plant back in the 1980's this process was not available. The filters are not designed to handle four feet. Modifying the filter bottoms would give us about two feet nine inches. He is recommending trying this in one filter, put some monitors on the effluent and see what is going on. It may help even if it is not four feet. This could be a pilot/trial program to see how it works. The South Fayette plant was

designed with this in mind. Sometime in the future the Water System might have to change. The filters at the South Fayette Plant are deep enough to put four feet in. The Crosstown Plant is not. They think it would do some good to try it.

Mr. Parrott commented that if the test does not work, or we are not satisfied with it, all we will be doing is taking the GAC media out and put the gravel and anthracite back in. Costwise it would be less than \$4,000.00 for materials. Changing from one to the other, just for the media is not that high a price. We have an opportunity to have a filter we can test to see what it would do for the current regulations. It would give us an idea for future regulations. The Board has already approved Mallett & Associates to do the design, but we have to get DNR approval. The approval process may be a little longer, but seven filters at Crosstown working with one out of service is not a problem with the current water demand. He stated he does not foresee a problem.

Chris Cofty asked how long the process would take. Mr. Parrott estimated the review process could possibly be a year. We would need to go through two seasons of water use to see the differences. Currently the filtering system catches a sample from all eight filters. Filter #7 will be set up with a pump for this one filter separately.

Mr. Mallett agreed to report the total cost at the next meeting.

EXECUTIVE SESSION:

Chairman Watkins made a motion and Tony Parrott seconded to adjourn to executive session for discussion of one real estate item.

Chairman Watkins discussed one item of real estate with the Committee. No action was taken.

There being no further business, Chairman Chuck Watkins adjourned the meeting at 8:55 A.M.

Chuck Watkins

The foregoing minutes were approved at the regular Water Committee meeting on the 11th day of February, 2004.

Lisa McElwaney